

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 987

HE 006 747

AUTHOR Dumke, Glenn S.; And Others  
TITLE Reflections from the 1973 Annual Meeting. Dynamics of Higher Education in Times of Change-Challenge.  
INSTITUTION National Association of Coll. and Univ. Business Officers, Washington, D.C.  
PUB DATE Jul 73  
NOTE 16p.  
AVAILABLE FROM National Association of College and University Business Officers, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036  
JOURNAL CIT NACUBO Professional File; v4 n5 Jul 1973  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.  
DESCRIPTORS Academic Freedom; Administrative Personnel; Administrative Policy; Collective Bargaining; \*Educational Administration; \*Educational Environment; \*Governance; \*Higher Education; Personnel Policy; \*Power Structure; Student Participation

## ABSTRACT

The document includes excerpts of papers presented at the 1973 Annual Meeting of NACUBO on the theme Dynamics of Higher Education. Dynamics was generally viewed either as a mix of problems colleges and universities were, are, or would be facing, or as a process by which current issues are being dealt with on campus. In each case, dynamics was considered with regard to implications for the future. Discussions of the dynamics of the educational environment, of the campus, of personnel management, and of institutional autonomy are included. (Author/JMF)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished \*  
\* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort \*  
\* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal \*  
\* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality \*  
\* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available \*  
\* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not \*  
\* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions \*  
\* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*



## PROFESSIONAL FILE

Reflections from the 1973 Annual Meeting

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICRO-  
FICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*NACUBO*  
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERAT-  
ING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NA-  
TIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION  
FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE  
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMIS-  
SION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION AND WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

## DYNAMICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

### *In Times of Change, Challenge*

Glenn S. Dumke  
Chancellor  
The California State University and Colleges

King V. Cheek, Jr.  
President  
Morgan State College

John D. Millett  
Vice President  
Academy for Educational Development, Inc.

Kingman Brewster, Jr.  
President  
Yale University

*With introductory remarks by the President of NACUBO*

William T. Haywood  
Vice President for Business and Finance  
Mercer University

The 1973 Annual Meeting of NACUBO was held on July 8-10 at the Conrad Hilton Hotel in Chicago, activities oriented around the theme "Dynamics of Higher Education."

This theme provided a challenging focus for the presentations of speakers and discussants. Varying definitions of higher education's "dynamics" emerged as sessions developed and participants voiced their major concerns and outlined what they considered to be new directions. "Dynamics" was generally viewed either as a mix of problems colleges and universities were, are or would be facing, or as a process by which current issues are being dealt with on campus. In each case, "dynamics" was considered with regard to implications for the future.

The participants comprised a highly qualified and articulate group of higher education spokesmen assembled to address issues of interest and concern. Excerpts of four papers delivered at the meeting, presented by individuals who do and have for years maintained positions of leadership in higher education, are contained in this issue to characterize the variety and level of discussion in sessions, and to portray the general mood or climate of this year's NACUBO Annual Meeting.

Discussions of the dynamics of the educational environment, of the campus, of personnel management, and of institutional autonomy are included herein in the order in which they were presented. For a full treatment of the excerpted papers which follow, remarks delivered in Chicago were transcribed and are available on tape cassettes from the NACUBO national office—\$5.00 apiece or \$20.00 for a set of the five presentations.



### HAYWOOD: SETTING THE STAGE

*The following represents a portion of a paper delivered at the opening general session by Mr. William T. Haywood. Mr. Haywood, pictured at the left with Yale President Kingman Brewster, performed his last official acts as President of NACUBO during the annual meeting. He is succeeded by Mr. Robert W. Meyer, Vice President of Business Affairs, Ohio Wesleyan University.*

... In a serious attempt to set the stage for this conference's examination of the dynamics of higher education, I wish to review a spectrum of developments which have taken place during the past two decades and bring us to our present task. The attempt is to speak to these developments as they have impacted the role of our profession in its response to higher education decision making in the past and present. . . .

#### *The Growth of External Control*

Until two decades ago, higher educational institutions were simply organized for management. Resources were meager by today's standards and human consumption accounted for the lion's share of resource allocation. Most agencies of government were largely unknown to all but a few of the research-oriented institutions and the colleges themselves were unknown to governmental agencies. Federal withholding taxes and the quarterly transfer of those taxes to the treasury constituted the only real contact between the majority of higher educational institutions and the federal government. Social security coverage for the employees of higher education was just beginning to appear on the scene. HEGIS was a decade hence and little thought was given to higher education statistics. Compliance reporting, assurances, fair labor standards, affirmative action—all such terms were uncoined and foreign to educational institutions. Unbelievably, it was exactly twenty years ago that education was first represented formally in the president's cabinet.

In the public sector there was little real concern by state and local governments for higher education institutions. Legislative appropriations were not substantial and the compensation paid to institutional employees was so low that there was little public concern

over the use of institutional resources. Private colleges had no financial contacts with the public sector and were regarded by the public as closed entities answerable only to themselves.

#### *Increased Participation in Decision Making*

As a result of the apathy of public concern, the organizational structure of collegiate institutions remained quite simple. The president was usually an academician with some insight into fiscal affairs. He was assisted as needed by a small staff of accountants and physical plant personnel who, while competent, lacked professional training and development. The president was the main source of contact between the institution and the world beyond its gates, and academia existed in an ivory tower undisturbed by external forces. In those halcyon days before mobility in academia, a substantial portion of the faculty on most college campuses spent their entire professional lives in a single institution. The institution was the object of loyalty, claiming far more from a classically-trained teacher than would a single academic discipline a generation later.

All began to change in the early fifties, ultimately leading to the present condition whereby faculties express concern lest the management of university finances occupy too dominant a role in setting priorities and making decisions, students demonstrate for participation in budgetary decisions, legislative appropriations provide battlegrounds for influence, and alumni create private foundations to support pet projects tangentially attached to the academy.

In the 1950s, faculties and eventually other university personnel began to demand an economic position more consistent with the improving economic status

of non-academy professionals. For the first time faculty mobility became a viable tool for upward economic mobility. Upward economic mobility required knowledgeable and widespread contacts within academic disciplines and the disciplines emerged as the objects of loyalty, replacing institutions.

### *Changing Modes of Support*

Concurrent with changes in faculty attitudes there developed public support for increased financing of both public and private educational institutions. This ground swell emanated in part from the considerable advance in higher educational opportunities afforded millions of returning servicemen and women following World War II and the GI Bill. As government had assisted veterans in higher education, these veterans and their families now insisted that government assist the higher education process for their own offspring who were approaching college age. Increasing technology in all of the pure and medical sciences and the determined insistence of the people for national defense preparedness brought public monies for the first time to a wide range of colleges, vaguely disguised for research.

The congress responded to the growing demand on the colleges first by authorizing long-term, low-interest loans for construction of dormitories, student centers, and other collegiate revenue-producing facilities. The clamor continued unabated, and in the late 1950s the congress responded with a broad-based and generous student loan program. Most business officers recall the tremendous growth in federal funds throughout the 1960s for the support of students, the support of academic disciplines identified in the national interest, and the support of teaching facilities through construction grants. As the social conscience of the nation emerged, the national policy was expanded to encompass the availability of higher educational opportunity for all citizens regardless of economic or social status. The unprogrammed but nationally applauded result reached by 1971 witnessed more than 51 percent of all high school graduates entering higher educational studies. The college degree reached a new peak of status.

### *Greater, More Varied Demands and Responses*

As the percentage of the public purse invested in higher education increased dramatically, so too did the interest of government in the internal operations

of higher education institutions. We became enmeshed with government rules, regulations and programs. The chief executive of an institution was no longer assisted by a limited staff of untrained associates able to comprehend and respond to the growing reporting and compliance requirements. Faculties generally resented the required increase in non-academic staffing while simultaneously demanding reduced faculty production and actively seeking increased input of public dollars, both of which compounded the object of their resentment. Regulations and procedures attached to most public funds were so numerous and complex that effective communication became almost impossible except among informed persons. Faculties, now totally loyal to their disciplines, highly mobile and no longer attached to a single campus, withdrew into their academic shells bursting forth only occasionally to complain that they no longer participated in institutional management decisions. In short, the typical college became a community of highly specialized "technocrat" compartmentalized into a wide variety of technological interests. As the management of the college required non-academic staffing to include specialists in accounting, computer service, purchasing, food, service and mental health, so too did individual academic departments specialize microscopically within disciplines, to the extent that they could no longer communicate with departmental colleagues in the same discipline.

\* \* \*

This circuitous route brings us to the point of critical analysis of the role of the professional college business and financial officer. It directly impacts our national organization. I would suggest the thesis that perhaps no single group of collegiate officers occupy more solidly a position of influence on future educational decision making than does the college business officer. Budgets have become so complicated, resource management so intriguingly involved, and reporting so difficult that few presidents and fewer academic officers can any longer comprehend the total collegiate picture. This places a special burden on the financial officer and creates for him the opportunity for a high level of professionalism and professional acceptance formerly unknown in higher education institutions though historically accepted for the corporate treasurer and comptroller. As professionals we should welcome the status while fully appreciating its burden.



## DYNAMICS OF THE EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

By Glenn S. Drumke

... If one discusses the dynamics of the educational environment, one is forced to confront the question of higher education's shortcomings, because practically every dynamic we confront is related to one of higher education's problems.

### *Central Issues Faced by Higher Education*

Let's take, for example, what is perhaps America's greatest accomplishment in the field of higher education: providing educational opportunity for everybody, opening the door for educational opportunity. We are really the first country in the world that has eliminated the elitism of higher education and truly democratized it, and we are still working nobly at it. Unfortunately, we are encountering one result of the democratization of higher education that we did not plan on. In an elitist educational system everybody gets a job or has a professional career when he graduates. In a democratized system we have found we can no longer guarantee that. This came as quite a shock to some people, particularly the young people getting the degrees who expected the jobs. As a result we are flailing about trying to provide some answer to what should have been obvious to everybody.

Another problem higher education is facing is financial pressure. The days of the gravy train are over. Everybody knows it, it is so evident that many have almost stopped talking about it. But it is a clear fact that the demands upon the public and benevolent dollar in welfare, medicare, and other pressures are such that higher education is due to get a much smaller proportionate slice of the fiscal pie in the future.

A third major issue that we are facing is that we now know that the traditional systems of academic governance are no longer as dependable or effective as

we once thought they were. The diffused decision-making process in which committees make most of the administrative decisions was proved not to be workable during the late 1960s. The necessity of administrative accountability is before us. Even though we are talking a good game trying to avoid it, what we are inevitably moving toward is a much more hierarchical system of academic governance than we have ever experienced before—except perhaps in the days of the small church-related college where the president himself *was* the institution. And the looming possibility of collective bargaining provides another complicating factor.

Another dynamic is the very evident lack of public confidence which has been clear and unmistakable ever since the campus wars of the 1960s. This is reflected in many ways—in the difficulty in funding from both public and private sources, in the declining enrollment trends nationwide. I do not think public confidence is at an all-time low. We are past that state and are now on the upgrade, but we still have a considerable distance to go to achieve the levels of confidence and esteem that we earlier enjoyed.

As long as we are listing problems, we must bring up one that is bothering everybody and which in its present context is genuinely new. This is the intrusion not so much of politics but of the political *process* into higher education. The move of legislatures to become themselves super boards, the administering of campuses by law rather than administrative delegation and board authority, the development of a situation in which student groups and faculty groups and administrations and boards must lobby their way through to solutions via the legislative process—all of these are upon us and our responses are confused.

It must be understood that we brought much of this on ourselves simply by regarding government as

the treasure trove of Ali Baba and using Sputnik as the open sesame. Clark Kerr once described the problem by quoting the old limerick about the young lady of Kent who said that she knew what it meant, when asked out to dine on lobsters and wine. She knew what it meant but she went. I think all of us recognized that building a tremendous dependence upon government largesse would lead to problems, but nevertheless we built it, and as a result we are now paying the piper—increased government control. Research-type institutions have become so dependent on federal funds that any diminution creates a crisis. State legislatures which previously had provided the money but permitted others to run the institutions now want to run them themselves; and in spite of all this, private institutions, hungry for the public dollar, are ignoring the experience of their public brothers and are making proposal after proposal involving increased government largesse for them and, inevitably, increased government control.

Even in the hitherto sacrosanct area of accreditation, we are at a point of crisis in which the whole issue of accreditation performed as a voluntary function by educators is on the defensive and is being threatened by the looming possibility of government licensure.

All of these so-called dynamics, or problems or issues or whatever you want to call them, add up to one conclusion: the recognition that higher education is not all we thought it was, the recognition that it has some problems, serious ones, that we have never been willing fully to recognize. It adds up in fact to a dynamic of disillusionment, and this situation provides us with, in the words of the old Chinese saying, both danger and opportunity. But in spite of the fact that I have learned that faculty members like to be told how good they are, and I presume business officers feel much the same way, I submit that there are certain negatives in our present situation that we will either squarely confront and solve or be overwhelmed by. And I assume that confrontation and solution is the direction in which business officers would much prefer to go.

### *Confronting the Central Issues*

Having looked at the low barometer and pointed out the hurricane signals, I now want to announce that there might well be a rainbow at the end of the storm and that the weather report is not all bad. It was said, you know, in frontier communities where the processes of law and order were wholly absent, that the first thing Americans did was to call a meeting to organize themselves and elect officers so that the problems could be confronted. I think academicians are

responding in much the same prompt way to many of the problems just listed.

For instance, the democratization of higher education has prevented us from guaranteeing everybody a job or a career. To meet this, one of the major national thrusts of the last couple of years has been "career education," an attempt to relate the educational process to postgraduate economic success, an attempt to make the traditional liberal arts degree much more practical in terms of application to career usefulness. There is much traditional academic resistance to these proposals and this thrust, but it is a necessary response to the democratization of higher education. It is a price we should be glad to pay, and our payment is long overdue.

The issue of financial pressure is being met by all kinds of ingenious responses. The mere act of presenting our case to government and the public has been refined and perfected to the point that we are much more efficient at it than we ever were before. The old feeling on the part of many public educators that private dollars were not for us—that if we raised a private dollar in a public educational institution, it would inevitably reduce the willingness of the legislature to support us from the public till—has been almost completely changed. Most presidents of public institutions now are actively engaged in development programs of all kinds, recognizing the fact that there should not be competition between public and private in this field, but rather coordination of effort to benefit all higher education. The sources of support of public and private higher education are coming closer and closer together, and within the next quarter century probably will come so close that the two types of institutions will be indistinguishable, at least in terms of this traditional definition. I think myself that this is a very good thing and that the dichotomy between public and private institutions has outlived its usefulness, especially since it is no longer basically a reality. . . .

The toughest problem that we have faced is restoration of public confidence, and I think the best answer to that has been provided by educators' sudden and creditable willingness to consider innovative techniques and new approaches in confronting their professional tasks. In January of 1971, I went before our board with a proposal that we shake up our entire educational process and stop giving degrees on the basis of time-serving, credits, units, hours, and number of years in class, but rather that we give our degrees on evaluated achievement, permitting the student to go as fast as his abilities warrant. We received generous funding from Carnegie, Exxon, and the state government to test out these proposals, and I asked the faculty for suggestions for pilot programs. I thought I would

be lucky to get a dozen. Instead, for the first year I received 150. Today, in the second year of the program, we are faced with 211 proposals for pilots, and I submit that this is a worthy and noble and creditable response which the public (which has a tendency to regard educators as stick-in-the-muds) ought to take into account in its assessment of our willingness to confront our current problems.

In confronting the issues of academic governance, we probably have made less progress than in these other areas because the solution to this problem runs so flatly counter to dearly-held academic tradition—the picture of a president being *primus inter pares* (first among equals), the feeling on the part of the faculty that major decisions, major academic directions, and even the mission of the institution, are faculty prerogatives. And now with the 18-year old vote and the development of student lobbying activities, the imminence of collective bargaining, the willingness of legislatures to defer to student whims and pressures in ways that previously were unfashionable, make the tightening up of the academic governance process an additionally difficult job. And yet during the campus wars of the 1960s we proved that traditional methods failed to work, we demonstrated the necessity for administrative authority, clearly defined responsibility, and accountability, and we devised as a result of those adventures in many systems and institutions certain excellent answers to such things as disciplinary processes, grievance proceedings, relationship of the institution to the civil authority, and so forth. As I say, we are still talking a good game in trying to resist basic changes in this area, but the changes are happening, and interestingly enough they are happening in a paradoxical fashion. The very legislators who respond to the demands and requests of faculty and student groups to run the institution on the basis of the model of a political state, with the faculty and students being

the legislature, are the first to insist that there be administrative accountability in the fiscal management of hard-won public dollars. Whenever the latter thrust comes in conflict with the former, the latter inevitably comes out ahead.

\* \* \*

There is one final item which must be stressed. The dynamics of our educational environment can no longer be classified as "academic" or "nonacademic." Each cross-ruffs with both. This adds up to a simple conclusion—we can no longer afford to leave certain problems to the professors and others to the business managers and administrators. *All* of us in higher education are facing these issues, and the solution cannot be arrived at in narrow compartments. It is as much the function of the business officer to concern himself about the necessity for more effective academic governance as it is the president's, or the academic senate's. It is as much the function of the business officer to worry about the intruding political process and the assumption of administrative operations by legislators as it is the dean's or the professor's. And the answers to these problems, the shaping of the dynamics of our environment to a positive and constructive mold, will require all hands and the cook. I am pleased to note the breadth of issues faced by the various sessions of this meeting, because the field which you represent gives you a competent background to assess and help solve the many issues faced by what was once—and will be again—the greatest and most effective higher educational system ever devised by modern man.

---

*Dr. Dumke was the keynote speaker of the meeting, delivering his paper at the opening session held on Sunday afternoon, July 8.*



## DYNAMICS OF THE CAMPUS

By King V. Cheek, Jr.

... Higher education as an institutional enterprise is now studied more than ever before. Many factors or influences are now emerging and receiving increased attention.

### *The Changing Role of the Academy*

First, the role of the academy is changing and expanding. No longer will college be viewed exclusively as places where 18-22 year old high school graduates come to listen to lectures and take notes and examinations for four years, whereupon by faculty vote they receive a degree.

Colleges and universities are being viewed as educational resource centers which must serve a larger, more diversified constituency. Evening colleges, adult and continuing education, cooperative education, university without walls, external degree and urban extension programs all expand the mission of the college and enable it to touch people who heretofore have not been considered educable or interested.

The expanded campus with its new population is already having a measurable impact upon the mode of instruction or the delivery of educational services. The conditions of life for all academicians will become more flexible. Cable television, dial-access retriever systems, and home operated cassettes will create a workable mechanism for self-directed instruction. Faculty may then be released from the domination of the traditional classroom. The work sites and work experiences of students will play more significant roles in their education. Their prior learning experiences will receive recognition as well.

As behavioral objectives and exit standards become more clearly defined and measurable, they will replace time spent as the major criterion for the baccalaureate

degree. Restrictions upon credit hour enrollment in a given term will be relaxed, and students will be permitted to move at their own rates of speed. The four-year lock step will become a remnant of the past as colleges focus primarily upon their function as credentialing agencies.

There is the expectation and demand that colleges have an outreach to society at large—that they extend the resources of the campus to promote solutions to urban problems. The extent to which colleges responsibly fulfill this mission will depend upon their perception of their basic mission—which is education. They can claim authority for nothing else.

\* \* \*

### *Shared Power in the Campus Structure*

Second, the shifts in the internal power arrangements of the college need careful study. All of the questions relating to shared power have not been answered.

- 1) How much sharing and under what circumstances is it required?
- 2) What are the prerogatives which belong exclusively to the faculty, the students, the administration, or the governing board?
- 3) Who is to be represented and why?
- 4) How is this representation to be determined?
- 5) To what extent will the interest of the supporting public be considered when decisions are made about representation?

These questions and many others continue to plague those who administer, teach, and learn in a university. Answers to questions will vary with the unique

circumstances of each college. Ultimate power resides in the board. The board traditionally delegates power and authority to implement policy and administer the college to the president, who alone is in turn responsible and accountable to the board.

The president delegates appropriate segments of this power to the constituent groups within the college. The amount of delegation may and perhaps should depend upon the maturity level of the college. For example, in an institution which is slowly developing from a state of academic bankruptcy with a mediocre staff and faculty, a stronger than usual chief executive is needed to make decisions. To give a mediocre faculty responsibility for recruiting other faculty and providing the guiding light for curricular reform would condemn the college to perpetual mediocrity. As the faculty develops, appointments of competent people will not be threatening, and the faculty could play a larger, more significant role in this process.

An important factor to consider is the willingness of the faculty to assume responsibility for participation in decision making. It is assumed that this is both a wish and desire of the faculty. This assumption may not be valid in all situations. The workload and scholarship responsibilities may be so burdensome that the faculty may prefer administrators to assume major decision-making responsibility. Also, there is the factor of impact. If faculty decisions are recommendations only and if they are consistently vetoed by a higher authority, less faculty involvement will be the result.

Whether and the extent to which students participate in governance may depend upon the character of the student culture. On a commuter campus where students have little contact with one another, the interest in campus politics and administration may indeed be lower than that of students who live in campus dormitories.

Students are transient. They come and go faster than the faculty. What may be the whim of one student population may become the object of hostility for the next. Care must be exercised in avoiding hasty responses to student group pressures for change. Their desire to be involved may be short-lived as they discover that governance and administration (for them membership on committees) are plain hard work.

There are, however, some clearly-defined faculty and student prerogatives. The faculty is generally regarded as the guardian of the academic program. They decide curriculum, course, and graduation requirements. Their decisions in these areas should be honored, both by presidents and board members. They should also be given the responsibility for enforcement of their own code of ethics—to promote professional peer-group judgment.

Students could assume responsibility for discipline within their rank, the quality of life in the dormitories, and activities of extracurricular organizations. Many of the functions in these areas now performed by administrators can and should be given to students. Not only is there the value of shifting the focus of student dissent away from the college administration to themselves, but there is the additional value of the benefits of this governing experience in the education process.

One must question whether students are really interested in governance. How high does participation rank among their priorities? Students will tell you that their primary goal is fairness in treatment. Where this is not achieved without their inputs, they must protect their interests by becoming involved. There is also the factor of time. Many students work to finance their own education. The time left for either student politics or campus governance is small.

This problem of available time affects the character and quality of student and faculty representation. In both cases there may be a minority viewpoint rising to power because of default of others. How do you guarantee that students and faculty represent the majority views and interest of their colleagues and peers? Accountability is minimized when participation in the electoral process is low. The implications are major. Often only those who have nothing else to do but criticize the administration receive a free ride to power. Those who are busily engaged in scholarly pursuits and who may have excellent ideas to contribute cloister themselves in their habitats of scholarship and research. Decisions in this process are less likely to be knowledge-based because of quick responses to militant demands. Preserving the peace rather than effective management may, under these circumstances, assume priority.

Shared power is an admirable objective if participatory democracy and the sense of community in academe are to be developed. But this objective can have real meaning if all members of the educational enterprise understand the burdens and demands placed upon all to professionally exercise their responsibilities and rights.

#### *Public Scrutiny and the Loss of Autonomy*

Third, the newly-emerging external forces are causing some colleges to rearrange their administrative processes. In general there is a greater public scrutiny of colleges and universities. They are no longer autonomous creatures immune to attack and criticism. They are now more open to investigation, examination, and censure.

Legislators want to ensure that taxpayers receive

a dollar return for a dollar invested. Alumni wish to preserve the enduring traditions which they come to appreciate only after graduation. The courts now give recognition to disputes once considered outside their jurisdiction. Unions and the AAUP have risen to tremendous power as collective bargaining rapidly becomes a fact of life.

#### *Job Security and Institutional Capacity To Change*

Fourth, the intense preoccupation with academic freedom and security of employment has profound effects upon the institutional capacity to change.

Tenure, the revered and cherished protector of academic freedom, upon close examination may reveal itself as a practice which does not in the least accomplish this objective.

The purpose of tenure is to protect academic freedom—to provide a climate within which educator-scholars could criticize and reform society without fear of intimidation or dismissal. The maverick in education, the one who is different and nonconforming, also needed protection from the traditionalist inside and outside the academy.

In many instances, tenure is the reward for staying around, for time spent. The maverick who must win the approval of his tenured colleagues and the board to receive this award either conforms or is pushed out. Academic freedom becomes a small circle embracing only the true believers and patriotic saints. If improperly used, tenure could become the means of protecting a specific point of view, of destroying the academy as a hostel for those who wish to seriously study and challenge our society.

The absence of faculty codes of ethics or their enforcement results in a low level of professional peer-group judgment, or none at all. The incompetent can then be guaranteed employment for life. Tenure is desirable and necessary. But colleges need to study their "culture" to ensure that the proper climate is developed where professional behavior of all parties is the hallmark and where reason in judgment and decision reigns supreme.

• • •

#### *Crisis Management and Dispute Mediation*

Fifth, crisis management is becoming both an art and a science. Those colleges which develop the expertise in this area will undoubtedly move faster toward accomplishing their governance goals. Conflict and crisis can consume large portions of time and can divert physical and psychological energy away from other priorities.

A system of handling grievances and mediating disputes between the constituent groups is essential. This must be done in a way which preserves the role of the president and the board for the functions of appellate review.

These factors represent only a sampling of those which impact upon colleges and universities today. They are a significant component of the current dynamics of the campus. . . .

---

*Dr. Cheek addressed the first regular session of the meeting on Monday morning, July 9.*



## DYNAMICS OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

By John D. Millett

... It is my firm conviction that personnel management is today one of a triumvirate of management preoccupations in higher education. The other two are planning management and budget or resource management. The three constitute a trio of management activities and responsibilities which are closely intertwined and which in combination will determine the future course of higher education in this country.

### *Manpower Planning in Colleges and Universities*

The importance of personnel planning is underlined for us today by the work of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. I presume that business officers are familiar with *A Manual for Manpower Accounting in Higher Education*, issued in 1972. In this manual it is proposed that all colleges and universities should institute a seven category classification of personnel: 1) executive, administrative, and managerial; 2) instructional; 3) professional; 4) technical; 5) office; 6) crafts and trades; and 7) service. And if you are equally familiar, as I assume you are, with the *Data Element Dictionary: Staff*, you have begun to realize how exacting are the needs for personnel information today.

Personnel management is now much more highly formalized than it has been in the past. Our record keeping must be much more precise, and information requirements about our staff resources as well as our staffing procedures are much more demanding than ever before.

But the NCHEMS documents have not provided us guidelines concerning the three most important issues of manpower planning in our colleges and universities today. These issues are those of workload, performance appraisal, and compensation. No one of us can claim to have grappled with the basic problems of

personnel management until he has undertaken to establish acceptable policies and procedures in these three troublesome areas.

The NCHEMS documents include forms and code numbers for faculty activity data. These data are not so much required for manpower planning as they are for allocating faculty expense between the primary program categories of instruction, research, and public service. But faculty activity data pertains to only one of seven suggested categories of staffing, and workload data are actually needed for all seven categories if manpower planning is to be comprehensive.

\* \* \*

In any event, workload planning is the essential first step in determining the faculty manpower requirements for a college or university. Such workload planning is equally essential in determining the needs for executive, administrative, and managerial manpower, and for all other kinds of manpower: professional, technical, office, crafts, and service.

I have been very much concerned to observe how participatory governance in our colleges and universities has been adding to our manpower requirements. We all seem determined to prove that Parkinson's Law is not a satire but a reality. Faculty members are complaining that they have to attend so many meetings which last so long that little time is left for instruction, research, and public service. The solution is obvious: reduced instructional workloads and the hiring of more faculty personnel. Students want less supervision of their personal and social lives but more services: birth control services, day care services, recreation services, counseling services, landlord services, and legal defense services. All of these mean more professional, technical, and office personnel.

It is high time, indeed it is past time, to place price tags and income tags upon every proposal for new services. We can no longer afford in higher education both better compensated personnel and more personnel. But there seem to be a good many people in higher education who have not yet grasped this basic fact.

\* \* \*

### *Collective Bargaining and Institutional Governance*

The second dynamic of personnel to be considered in this analysis is that of collective bargaining. So much has been written and said on this subject, including the recent publication of the American Council on Education written by Robert K. Carr and Daniel K. VanEyck, that there is little need for extensive comment here. I do wish to mention what I think is the primary issue to be resolved in faculty collective bargaining: the relationship of collective bargaining to institutional governance.

This relationship involves at least two somewhat contrasting situations. It is my observation over the past two or three years that faculty collective bargaining is likely to appear in a particular college or university as a result of faculty anxiety in relation to institutional management. This faculty anxiety may be triggered by circumstances of reduced enrollment and falling income. This faculty anxiety may also be triggered by a widely held perception that the administration has not dealt frankly and fully with the faculty in handling institutional resources. This observation does not apply to the State University of New York or the City University of New York where faculty collective bargaining must be explained in terms unique to New York.

If a situation of adequate faculty involvement in institutional governance had existed, I believe the drive for collective bargaining in many instances would be unlikely to appear or less likely to win widespread adherents. For a long time I have preached and practiced extensive disclosure of facts about institutional budgeting and institutional financial experience. Today, income and expenditure budgeting as well as fiscal reporting must be undertaken with the widespread participation of all the constituencies involved. . . . In other words, institutional governance on a participatory basis appears to me to be an alternative, the only alternative, to faculty collective bargaining. . . .

The contrasting aspect of this relationship between collective bargaining and institutional governance arises when a college or university attempts both arrangements. In certain instances collective bargain-

ing has been undertaken as a means to achieve some new pattern of institutional governance. In certain other instances, there have been simultaneous efforts to achieve a new pattern of governance and a new practice of faculty collective bargaining. Indeed, as I understand the position of various national bodies seeking to become the designated collective bargaining agent for faculty members, that position is that there is no conflict between institutional governance and collective bargaining.

The official line on any matter is one thing. The actual practice may be something else. As I now observe the academic scene in this country, I am more and more inclined to believe that collective bargaining and participatory governance are incompatible one with the other. Certainly it is too early to be positive about this based upon experience. The potential for conflict is obvious, and I understand that in a few instances this conflict has already occurred.

If a structure of governance appears in our colleges involving policy determination through an academic community council comprising faculty, students, administrators, professional staff, and operating staff, then faculty collective bargaining becomes an exercise in faculty negotiation with faculty representatives. The possibilities of mischief in any such situation are considerable. And if an academic community council approves a collective bargaining agreement with the faculty, then enforcement of that agreement must be undertaken in the name of the community council. Thus faculty representatives will be confronted with the need to carry out agreements to which they are a party. Sooner or later, the incompatibility of participatory governance and collective bargaining will become widely apparent.

\* \* \*

### *Affirmative Action—The Marvelous Monster*

It is time to turn to a few words of comment about that marvelous monster of our day, affirmative action. There is no point in bemoaning our fate or trying to construct barricades of resistance. The battle has already been fought and won or lost, depending upon which side of the conflict you happened to have enlisted. Equal employment opportunity is with us, along with all its accoutrements, including affirmative action. It may be that in time our institutions will learn how to live with affirmative action even as public utilities have learned how to live with rate regulation and business has learned how to live with anti-trust laws and fair trade regulation. But do not expect the basic laws themselves to be repealed.

My words of comment are intentionally ironic. I listened for eight years to twelve state university presidents who espoused a common theme. That theme was that a state board of higher education was a threat to institutional autonomy. And other state higher education executive officers have listened to the same complaint.

I want to point out that in the field of personnel management institutional autonomy has been irretrievably lost, lost not to state boards of higher education but lost to the federal government and to its personnel legislation. Institutional autonomy was attacked and defeated by the forces of enlightenment, by those liberals in society determined to overcome the evils of employment discrimination against blacks, other racial and ethnic minorities, and women. Institutional autonomy was surrendered without a whimper because there was no rational or moral defense higher education could muster to explain its past failings.

I think there is a very important lesson here, one which has been understood by only a handful of American citizens. The price of freedom is not just eternal vigilance and sometimes bloodshed. The price of freedom is individual and institutional self-restraint. There is only one justification for the autonomy of a college or university, and that is the educational and social responsibility of its behavior. The failure of that sense of responsibility in program and expenditure expansion on the part of state universities produced the state boards of higher education as we know them today, and has produced for all of higher education the prospect of state commissions of postsecondary education as prescribed in Section 1202 of the Education Amendments of 1972. The failure of that sense of responsibility in personnel management has produced the requirements of affirmative action today.

Amid the confusions about whether or not a goal is a quota and about whether or not the job qualifications of one person are equal to those of another, we need to bear one important factor in mind. Personnel management may not have the answer to equal employment opportunity but without competent and precise personnel management every college and university is bound to be in trouble in demonstrating its

acceptance of the legal requirements of equal employment opportunity.

The business officer of one major university told me not long ago that the new personnel record system introduced in accordance with an affirmative action agreement would cost the university some \$250,000 a year to maintain. I suspect that this is an underestimate rather than an overestimate. And I have not heard yet of any proposed federal government grants to defray the costs of affirmative action. The costs will have to be borne by charges to students, the appropriations of state legislators, or hopefully the benefactions of enlightened philanthropists. But costs there will be, and someone must pay them.

I trust I have said enough to suggest that the dynamics of personnel management are truly dynamic. Just as higher education is no longer the cozy world of one million students, of enrollment amounting to 12 percent of the college age group, and of total expenditures of \$500 million a year such as was the case when I went to college in 1929, so the personnel management of higher education in the 1970s cannot be compared with that of any earlier day. Personnel management in our colleges and universities today has its own explicit needs, and an institution of higher education ignores those needs at its peril.

Somehow I have great confidence that the business officers of our colleges and universities will be equal to the task. Our academic personnel managers have much they can learn about personnel management in general from their colleagues, the business officers. After all, much of what seems so new today in academic personnel management has been practiced in non-academic personnel management for a good many years. As always, business officers can do much to help bring about the integrated, comprehensive personnel management which every college and university today requires. That help is readily available. I just hope all our colleges and universities will have enough sense to make use of it!

---

*Dr. Millett presented his paper at a luncheon held on Monday afternoon, July 9.*



## DYNAMICS OF INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY

By Kingman Brewster, Jr.

... There is no essential difference between the public and the private university when it comes to both independence and accountability. The ideal of both is the same. Each have their imperfections. Each falls short of their ideal. The private university has to struggle to be sure that it does not knuckle under to any special interests in the private sectors on which it relies. The public university must struggle to be sure that it does not become a tool of the political interests upon which it depends.

The goal of autonomy is not the exclusive concern of the private institution. The objective of public service is not the monopoly of the publicly-supported institution. Why is this independence, this much vaunted "autonomy" so important to every university's health?

### *The Protection of Academic Freedom*

The most traditional answer is "academic freedom." The right of the individual to follow the gleam of his own conscience and curiosity is indispensable to any academic enterprise. Good teaching requires conviction. Teaching cannot be commanded from above. You cannot teach effectively if you do not mean what you say.

Significant research is inherently fault-finding. It seeks to spot the weaknesses of things as they are. Creative scholarship must try to improve upon the inherited wisdom. This is bound to be troublesome, especially in times of rapid change and doubt. Good faculties are looking for trouble.

When this critical, skeptical, even heretical, habit of mind is brought to bear on some wholly incomprehensible field like the number of molecules in the focus of a microscope, there is not much public provocation.

Bring skepticism to bear on matters of taste or judgment, however, and it is everybody's business. Worst of all, when heretical criticism plays upon the subject of ideological passion, then legislators and alumni alike will be driven up—and over—the wall.

The tradition of trusteeship allows the society to tolerate these inherently troublemaking aspects of a good, lively university, whether it is public or private. If it were not for the insulation of trustees or regents, standing between faculty and the university's financial constituencies, it would be hard to imagine how we would indulge that faculty self-determination which is so essential to free inquiry, to discovery, and to enthusiastic teaching from conviction.

### *Initiative, Creativity and Competition*

The second virtue of our independence is not just our freedom from external dictate, but the freedom of each unit to follow its own style, to make its own bets about what is important, to make the most of comparative advantage—field by field, school by school, as well as university by university.

The dispersion of initiative within the university, down through the schools and departments, often drives the orderly command-conscious business mentality to distraction. Each faculty group is held accountable, much less by lines of authority to the top of their own institution, than by the competitive pressure of the peerage of their field or profession throughout the country and, in some cases, throughout the world of learning.

All of us, of course, take the competitive measure of our own institutions, tested against our rivals. We really keep competitive score only by cumulating the standing of our separate schools, departments, and

programs. Certainly the stimulus to competition is at the level of schools and departments, largely in terms of the scramble to attract the faculty and students which are most sought after.

At the output end of the process, competition is measured in terms of our ability to place graduates from college to graduate and professional school, or from all levels into the world of employment. This too has meaning only in terms of particular fields and professions.

On the output end of research and scholarship, too, there is no university which can expect to be "second to none" in all fields. Here again, scorekeeping makes sense only in discreet areas of sub-disciplines, far more refined than whole schools or departments.

We are no different from all markets which rely on competition. It is the variety of the competitors which gives the national educational enterprise its vitality. I believe this competition among a variety of centers of initiative is the genius of American higher education. It is no different from the special quality of our economy in the production of goods and the provision of services, as long as the market is truly competitive. I see no tendency to monopoly, no sign of a cartel movement in the university market. In higher education there is every evidence that *laissez-faire* can be counted on to encourage a piratical zeal which assures the stimulus of all by all.

All this is familiar—the essentiality of our independence for academic freedom, and the competitive vitality of self-determined faculties, driven by constructive rivalry.

#### *An Ethical Aspect of Independence*

More recently it has come upon me that there is also an *ethical* aspect of our independence. Our autonomy, our reliance so largely upon voluntary association, in contrast to status or command, may have a message of some moral significance to our country. Autonomous universities may make a distinctive contribution to the nation, especially at a time of widespread moral disarray and doubt in the halls of government and the marts of trade.

Those of us who dwell and have our being in the country's great voluntary associations (whether nominally public or private) must beware the danger of self-righteousness. While so much of the rest of the country's organized life is driven in the private profit sector by material ends, and in the politically organized sector by the quest for power, it may be that autonomous voluntary associations have a special heartening message to the nation.

I remember the cartoon in the *New Yorker* which portrayed two monks walking in their cloister, and one turned to the other and said, "but I *am* holier than thou!" This I would not claim for universities, in relation to the political and commercial sectors of society. Anyone who has dwelt in the groves of academe knows how back-biting, how avaricious, how petty, and how mean the politics of academic advancement and academic preference can be. We cannot claim any moral superiority of individual motivation. We can, however, make an ethical claim for the tradition of academic enterprise.

\* \* \*

... Hospitable acceptance of disturbing discussion and dissent is not easily expected in a business organization or a political organization which has its eye focused on the single purpose of profit or the single objective of power. The university calling which brings us here is different from the single purpose enterprise or the single purpose political crusade. We not only accept, but we glory in the turmoil of diversity and the risks of free criticism. This is the essence of the academic ethic.

Such a community is surely frustrating to work in, let alone preside over. Our instinct for the neatness of order is outraged. Our urge for short-run efficiency is stymied. It is hard not to clobber a clearly bad idea forthwith, without waiting for the endless processes of consultation and deliberation to run their course. Patience is perhaps the single most important attribute of those who would well serve an enterprise which must lean over backward not to assume that the fool is a knave.

I urge you to remember constantly the special calling which you and I have undertaken. That calling seeks to make possible the constructive life and work of others, who will do better if they are not told what to think or what to teach. If they are to teach gladly, they must speak for themselves, not for us. Especially if they are to improve upon the heritage of their chosen fields, they must be free to question ancient beliefs, including beliefs which you and I hold dear.

In this time of moral anguish throughout our land, we may take a certain pride in the fact that for three centuries our free universities have been living proof of the conviction that constructive work can be encouraged by competitive ambition. This is an ambition not to please but to excel.

When the political and the financial sectors of the nation seem to be caricatured by corruption, America may find its most stable, its most honorable, tradition in private voluntary associations: in neighborhood

organizations, in charitable undertakings, in hospitals, churches, and especially in free institutions of higher learning.

Education may seem inefficient because it is not tightly programmed. Intellectuals may sometimes seem off the mark of both common and uncommon sense. But the spirit of universities is one of voluntary, self-motivated effort in the quest for truth. A vital university must be, in David Riesman's phrase, truly "inner directed," not dominated by the aim to please or the fear of the displeasure of some boss or customer

or "owner." If you can believe in this cause, not for itself alone, but also because of its importance to the quality of a free Republic, then all your toil and trouble, and especially your patience with the freedom of others, will be amply rewarded.

---

*Mr. Brewster delivered his presentation at the NACUBO Annual Banquet, held on Monday evening, July 9.*

---

*PROFESSIONAL FILE is a publication series presenting papers of professional quality selected with regard to their value as examinations on broad or original concepts in college and university management. Papers are published upon recommendation of the Publications Committee after careful review involving, as appropriate, other NACUBO committees or persons of experience in the subject fields. Views thus expressed, however, are the final responsibility of the authors and their publication does not signify acceptance or endorsement by NACUBO.*